



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/080,477	02/22/2002	Richard Brown	B-4518 619564-1	8511

7590

07/27/2005

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

TRUONG, THANHNGA B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2135

DATE MAILED: 07/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/080,477

Applicant(s)

BROWN ET AL.

Examiner

Thanhnga B. Truong

Art Unit

2135

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 February 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 February 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau. (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/24, 5/15/02, 2/25, 12/8/03.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 4/24/2002, 5/15/2002, 2/25/2003, and 12/08/2003 are in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, these information disclosure statements are considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Helbig, Sr. (US 5,841,868), and further in view of McNabb et al (US 6,289,462 B1).

a. Referring to claim 1:

i. Helbig teaches:

(1) an assessor receiving a report from, and pertaining to the trustworthiness of, a first computing device, and the assessor updating the trust policy of a second computing device in accordance with the report [**i.e., a trusted computing system according to the invention includes a general-purpose computing apparatus with a keyboard port adapted to be coupled to a keyboard, and which is responsive to signals applied to the keyboard port to perform its function. The system also includes a keyboard with a plurality of keys and an output port, for generating keyboard signals representing keystrokes at the output port of the keyboard. A dumb card reader is coupled to the output port of**

the keyboard and to the keyboard port of the computing apparatus. The dumb card reader is adapted for coupling a removable access control card to the keyboard output port and to the keyboard port of the computing apparatus, and in one embodiment of the invention is also arranged for powering the access control card. The system according to the invention also includes a plurality of removable access cards adapted to be coupled to the dumb reader. Each of the access cards includes memory adapted for storing personal identification information such as a personal identification number of the authorized user to whom the card is issued. Within the card, a comparator is coupled to the memory, for, in a first mode of operation, comparing the keyboard signals with the personal identification information stored in the card memory, and for, when the comparator matches the keyboard signals with the personal identification information, switching to a second mode of operation, and for, in the second mode of operation, coupling the keyboard signals to the keyboard port of the computing apparatus. The system is secure, even against an unauthorized person who gains control of an access card, because no keyboard signals reach the computer itself until the personal information is verified by the card. Only an access card, together with knowledge about the information stored in the card's memory, can provide access (column 2, lines 28-60 and Figure 1)].

ii. Although Helbig teaches a trusted computing system as shown in Figure 1, Helbig is silent about receiving the report from the authorized card users. On the other hand, McNabb teaches:

(1) A set of records that collectively provide documentary evidence of processing. The audit trail enables tracing of events forward from the original transactions to related records and reports, and backward from records and reports to their component source transactions (column 7, lines 29-33 of McNabb). For example, a user initiating a print request from a database application would initially be permitted access to only that portion of the database that the user is permitted to view based on their role. Each row of a database table may have an extended attribute reflecting the authorization level or role that is required to view that record. This may be

Art Unit: 2135

defined at the row insertion point where the default permission for the row corresponds to the level of the user that inserted the row. In this manner, the report would determine the role of the user to determine the level of the records that may be retrieved (**column 18, lines 52-62 of McNabb**).

iii. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to:

(1) have combined the teaching of McNabb into Helbig's system in which security against unauthorized access is provided (**column 1, lines 5-6 of Helbig**).

iv. The ordinary skilled person would have been motivated to:

(1) have combined the teaching of McNabb into Helbig's system wherein to such a system having security features for enabling control over access to data retained in such a system.

b. Referring to claim 2:

i. McNabb further teaches:

(1) wherein the assessor updates the trust policies of multiple computing devices in accordance with the report [**i.e., referring to Figure 4, the security attributes of the process and file are already established. In addition, managers seeking to upgrade security on their systems are thus often forced to rely on vendor claims of security performance. As new software emerges and inevitable upgrades to existing software pour in, IS professionals typically assume that the vendors have a vested interest in the security of their products. Given the potential implications of security system failure, it is critical that managers concentrate on security solutions that have undergone independent evaluation, testing, and certification (column 3, lines 64-67 through column 4, lines 1-5).**].

c. Referring to claims 3-8, 12-14:

i. These claims have limitations that is similar to those of claim 2, thus they are rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 2 above.

d. Referring to claims 9-11:

Art Unit: 2135

i. These claims have limitations that is similar to those of claims 1-4, thus they are rejected with the same rationale applied against claims 1-4 above.

e. Referring to claim 15:

i. McNabb further teaches:

(1) a requestor, for requesting the report from the first computing device **[i.e., referring to Figure 1, element 6].**

f. Referring to claim 16:

i. Helbig teaches:

(1) a receiver for receiving a report from, and pertaining to the trustworthiness of, a first computing device, an updater for updating the trust policy of a second computing device in accordance with the report, and a transmitter for transmitting the updated policy to the second computing device, and the system further comprising first and second computing devices, wherein at least the first computing device comprises a reporter for sending a trustworthiness report to the assessor and at least the second computing device comprises a memory maintaining a trust policy such that the trust policy is modifiable by the transmitter **[i.e., referring to Figure 2, and further details are met on column 3, lines 53-67 through column 4, lines 1-32].**

ii. Although Helbig teaches a trusted computing system as shown in Figure 1, Helbig is silent about receiving the report from the authorized card users. On the other hand, McNabb teaches:

(1) A set of records that collectively provide documentary evidence of processing. The audit trail enables tracing of events forward from the original transactions to related records and reports, and backward from records and reports to their component source transactions (column 7, lines 29-33 of McNabb). For example, a user initiating a print request from a database application would initially be permitted access to only that portion of the database that the user is permitted to view based on their role. Each row of a database table may have an extended attribute reflecting the authorization level or role that is required to view that record. This may be defined at the row insertion point where the default permission for the row corresponds

Art Unit: 2135

to the level of the user that inserted the row. In this manner, the report would determine the role of the user to determine the level of the records that may be retrieved (**column 18, lines 52-62 of McNabb**).

iii. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to:

(1) have combined the teaching of McNabb into Helbig's system in which security against unauthorized access is provided (**column 1, lines 5-6 of Helbig**).

iv. The ordinary skilled person would have been motivated to:

(1) have combined the teaching of McNabb into Helbig's system wherein to such a system having security features for enabling control over access to data retained in such a system.

g. Referring to claim 17:

i. This claim has limitations that is similar to those of claim 16, thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 16 above.

h. Referring to claim 18:

i. This claim has limitations that is similar to those of claim 11, thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 11 above.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

a. Meyers et al (US 5,937,159) discloses a system and method for controlling the access of users to a trusted computer system using an authentication and authorization database, containing information used to authenticate human users and information establishing what each user can do, and a number of software processes, including session initiation, authorization, credentials and database management daemons. (see abstract).

b. Summers et al (US 6,098,133) discloses an apparatus is provided to handle classes of data in computer systems that must not be permitted to intermingle

Art Unit: 2135

due to their security classifications or criticality of their data content, as in banking or safety applications (see abstract).


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thanhnga (Tanya) Truong whose telephone number is 571-272-3858.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached at 571-272-3859. The fax and phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-2100.

TBT

July 24, 2005



KIM VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100